

APPENDIX A: ISSUES, QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS FROM PUBLIC MEETINGS

At each of the public meetings (Table 1), representatives from the Division of Entomology and Plant Pathology presented the proposed Gypsy Moth project, and answered and received questions and comments. The presentation explained:

- the life cycle, feeding habits and hosts of Gypsy Moth,
- the identification of Gypsy Moth,
- survey methods,
- Gypsy Moth impacts and damage to the trees and forest,
- selection of proposed sites,
- selection of the treatment options,
- the timing and application of treatments,
- boundaries of the treatment sites with maps and photos,
- and the public comment time period and decision process.

Both during and following the presentation, questions and comments were taken, answered and discussed with the people attending the meetings. A representative from Purdue University also attended some of the meetings and assisted in answering and discussing questions and comments from the people attending the meetings.

The questions and comments received at the public meetings concerned four main issues:

- Human and animal health and safety;
- Nontarget effects and environmental effects;
- Economic and political impacts;
- Likelihood of success of the proposed project, past projects and the treatment options proposed.

ISSUES

Human health and safety

The questions and comments received at the public meetings regarding human health and safety were in three areas:

- The use and risks of Btk and pheromone flakes
- The decision and notification process for the implementation of the project
- The time of application of Btk and pheromone flakes

Btk questions were asked concerning the risk to adults and children; why the Btk label states it cannot be applied over water; when people can go outside again after a treatment; how soon outdoor vegetables and fruit can be eaten and whether or not the product label are up to date. The responses explained that no hazards-either immediate or cumulative, have been identified for the general public when exposed to Btk; that Btk naturally occurs

in the soil; that treatments are not conducted when school buses or children are outside in the site; that Btk is applied to foliage and that there is not a need or justification to apply Btk over water and the statement on the product label prevents misuse of the product; that Btk dries in about 30 minutes and we recommend people wait that amount of time before going outside; that Btk is approved for use in organic gardening and that vegetables should just be washed for eating; and that we check annually during treatment planning for updates to product labels.

Pheromone flake questions were asked concerning the risk to adults and children; when people can go outside after a treatment and whether or not the product label is up to date. It was responded that no hazards, either immediate or cumulative, have been identified for the general public when exposed to pheromone flakes; that flakes should settle on trees or the ground by about 30 minutes; and that the product label is checked for updates during treatment planning.

Questions that were asked regarding the decision and notification process for proposed treatments were: would the public be notified of the when the treatments will occur and would updates be posted on the website. The responses explained that residents will be notified by mail approximately two weeks prior to the treatment; that residents would be notified through local media (radio, television, newspaper) a couple days prior to the treatment and that updates will be posted to our website.

Questions were asked regarding the time of the application and the response was that the timing of the treatments was dependent upon weather conditions and that treatments are generally started in the early morning hours (first light). Btk treatments are applied during May and pheromone flake treatments are applied during June.

One person attending meetings for one treatment site expressed concerns regarding possible long term effects of Btk and pheromone in people after being exposed, but was going to obtain additional information from Purdue University.

Non target effects and environmental effects

Questions were asked if Btk affects cats, dogs, birds and bird food and flowers. It was responded that Btk does not negatively effect cats, dogs, birds or bird food and flowers. It was also asked if Btk affects other butterflies or moths. Responses stated that Btk. can affect other butterfly and moth caterpillars; however Btk will be applied at a time of year when the majority of caterpillars have not hatched yet. Btk only affects the larval or caterpillar stage.

The question was asked if the pheromone flakes were biodegradable and it was stated that yes, they were biodegradable.

The questions were asked how winds could affect treatments. It was responded that winds could delay treatments, as we want to avoid any drift problems of the products and want to make sure the products are applied to the intended site.

Economic and political impacts

Questions were asked regarding where the funding comes from for treatments and what the cost is to homeowners. It was also asked what happens when areas cannot obtain federal funding to cover costs of treatments. Responses included: the cost of treatments is shared between the USDA, Forest Service and the Indiana Dept. of Natural Resources and there is no cost to the homeowners. When federal funding is not available, homeowners would have to cover costs for treatments if they wanted their areas treated.

Questions were asked regarding how and when we will decide on whether to treat the proposed sites and if we will treat the proposed sites unless landowners oppose. The response stated that we would take comments from the meetings until February 15, 2007 and use the feedback comments to make our decision and that if landowners did not oppose, then we would treat.

There were a couple questions in regards to quarantines; such as, if Allen County was quarantined for gypsy moth, what a quarantine means and how it impacted campgrounds. It was responded that Allen County was under quarantine and that a quarantine puts legal restrictions on the movement of material that is of risk of spreading gypsy moth from that infested or quarantined county to a non infested county. We focus on education of campers to inspect their recreational vehicles and outdoor articles for gypsy moth before they leave quarantined areas.

One resident expressed that he was tremendously thankful to Indiana for keeping gypsy moth out of here and that state conducted treatments were an asset to him. He stated that Indiana is diligent and upfront with information.

Likelihood of success of the proposed project and the treatment options proposed

Questions concerning: the demonstrated effectiveness of Btk; whether or not gypsy moth would remain or return to that treated area and whether or not we would return to treat that same area again were asked. Responses stated that: Btk has proven effective in controlling gypsy moth since the 1970's and we have used it in Indiana since the early 1990's here in Indiana with good success. Gypsy moth will remain in treated areas at some population level and it is possible we may have to return to an area to retreat in future years.

Other questions and concerns

Questions were asked about: trapping and survey methods; who they could contact to come look at their trees; general biology questions about gypsy moth; what control options were available to homeowners; what natural predators/pathogens were present in Indiana; how to look for egg masses; how soon defoliation might occur; what plant species gypsy moth prefers; how low the planes fly and a number of questions regarding other insect pest issues and their control.

The response for trapping and survey methods explained how traps are set based on a grid system and how moth counts are used to locate increasing populations and then the moth counts are then used to try and locate egg masses.

The response for whom to contact to investigate possible gypsy moth finds on properties stated that the IDNR would send a local employee out to examine trees.

Several general questions on biology were responded to, by restating information from the presentation slides and by explaining the difference between gypsy moth and other common caterpillars.

Control and survey options for homeowners were explained such as: burlap banding, soybean oil sprays and insecticide sprays. It was stated that egg masses can be found anywhere on a tree or on any outdoor article, house or vehicle. Gypsy moth defoliation may not occur for several years in an infested area.

It was responded that Indiana does have some natural animal and bird predators and also a pathogen that will kill gypsy moth.

The responses of preferred gypsy moth hosts included many urban landscape tree and shrub species, with over 500 known species as hosts.

It was responded that the treatment planes fly low, just over the tree tops. Usually 50-100 feet above the tree tops, but sometimes higher depending on the site.

Lastly, a number of other responses were given in answer to questions on many other insect species, based on the information given at the meeting.

Table 1: Date, time and attendance of public meetings for the proposed treatment sites by county.

COUNTY	SITE	DATE	TIME	# Attending
Allen	Cedarville MD Coldwater Crescent Crestwood MD Hathaway Maplecrest Parkridge Smith	January 24, 2007	7:00 PM	55
Allen	Grabill	January 25, 2007	6:30 PM	3
Allen	Cedarville MD Coldwater Crescent Crestwood MD Hathaway Maplecrest Parkridge Smith	January 31, 2007	2:00 PM 6:30 PM	34
Elkhart	Goshen 07	January 18, 2007	4:00 PM	27
Elkhart	Wakarusa 07 County Road 9 & 36	January 26, 2007	2:00 PM	8
Porter	Willow Creek	January 23, 2007	3:00 PM	7
Porter	Aberdeen	January 24, 2007	11:00 AM	32
Porter	Aberdeen	January 30, 2007	3:30 PM	17
Whitley	Blue Lake 07 Churubusco Woods	February 1, 2007	6:30 PM	5